RRR
ROTHBARD-ROCKWELL REPORT
SEPTEMBER 1991 VOLUME II, NUMBER 9

Undercounting Hispanics

by Murray N. Rothbard

If the rationale for eternally cosseting and privileging blacks is the ever-receding "legacy of slavery" (now a century-and-a-half long gone), then what is the excuse for doing the same for Hispanics? Hispanics were never enslaved, at least not within the borders of the United States. It is true that they have not been doing very well in our upwardly mobile society, but does mere failure entitle one to permanent privilege at the expense of the able? Is it the difficulty of transferring from the Spanish language to English? But all immigrants, except those from Britain, have had to adopt a new language, and most have done very well. Is there something about the Spanish language that makes the transition difficult? But actual immigrants from Spain seem to do well, as do immigrants from Cuba or Argentina. Indeed, there seem to be two particular sets of Hispanic immigrants who do badly and are therefore the recipients of quotas and affirmative action: Mexicans (usually in the West), and Puerto Ricans (in the East).

Does mere failure entitle one to permanent privilege?

One strange Hispanic problem has recently appeared in New York City. Now that elections have been brutally shifted from the state and local to federal jurisdiction, the U.S. government has decided, in its wisdom, that New York City governance, featuring a Board of Estimate with a fixed number from each borough, was "discriminatory," since the people from less populous boroughs are over-represented, and from more populous boroughs, under-represented. Indeed, the fanatical federal courts are determined to stamp out all areas where proportional representation does not exist; only the explicit clauses of the U.S. Constitution prevent them from overturning the clearly disproportionate system of having two senators from each state.

Under the command of the federal government, New York has expanded the number of city councilmen that now constitute its governing body, and has been desperately trying to gerrymander the district lines to create as many black, Hispanic, and even gay districts as possible. In New York, the big push is on to correct the allegedly grievous "under-representation" of Hispanics. Now even though

(Cont. page 2, col. 1)

THE EAR

by Sarah Barton

America's Only Libertarian Gossip Columnist

Hardworking Norm McConnell has been virtually expelled from the Massachusetts LP for being too normal. Norm, who did heroic ballot access work for the Ron Paul campaign, denounced the anti-Paul cabal of social misfits who run that historically bizarre (even for the LP) state party. Norm was in turn attacked for not being a lifestyle libertarian, and told to make himself scarce.

* * * * *

Randians all over America are pressuring Justin Raimondo *not* to publish his blockbuster article on the "ominous parallels" between a 1922 Old Right novel and *Atlas Shrugged*. Justin's title: "Who Is Henry Galt?"

* * * * *

Dave Boaz, executive veep of the left-libertarian Cato Institute, defines "bigotry" in a letter to the editor of the *Washington Blade*, D.C.'s gay newspaper, as being "firmly committed to the 'heterosexual ethic.'"

* * * * *

A subscriber calls to say that *Reason* magazine rented his name to the "Society for the Right To Die." Nothing wrong with that, says our man, but isn't it interesting that a suicide group sees *Reason*ettes as customers? "They wouldn't rent the *RRR* list!" ●

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leftist ideology proclaims blacks and Hispanics to be in permanent solidarity against the hated white oppressors, in actual fact blacks and Hispanics tend to live cheek-by-jowl with one another in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Queens, and so an increase in the number of Hispanics in the City Council or Congress is likely to mean a drop in the number of blacks.

Oddly enough, the Department of Justice, even though commending the New York redistricters for doing a heroic job of racial and ethnic gerrymandering, has disallowed the redistricting plan for not guaranteeing more Hispanic victories. What seems to be the problem with the Hispanics? In several districts, for example, the District Commission created districts with a clear Hispanic majority, not just of the population but also of people of voting age. So if there are several districts where 51 or 53 percent of the voting age population is Hispanic, what's the fuss all about? Why does the result still "discriminate" against the Hispanics?

The answer: it seems that Hispanics, in large numbers, don't vote. In the proposed District 8, for example, which includes East Harlem and part of the South Bronx, over 50 percent of voting age population is Hispanic, but Hispanics constitute only 40 percent of registered voters. Therefore, the chances of an Hispanic being elected from the district are minimal. But if Hispanics are too lazy or whatever to vote, why should *other* ethnic groups, who vote more heavily, be penalized? Shouldn't representation be based on voting age population, thereby rewarding voters instead of penalizing them? And *why* don't Hispanics vote, anyway? Who knows? Difficulties with English? But surely this is an English-speaking country, and public business should be conducted in English, as it has been for all previous immigrant groups. Why should Hispanics receive special privileges if they are too indifferent to learn English? Perhaps because more illegal immigrants are Hispanic? But surely illegal immigrants can hardly be expected to demand proportional representation. Illegal immigrants should count themselves lucky that they are not rounded up and sent home, much less demand that they be represented in the legislature.

Why should Hispanics receive special privileges if they are too indifferent to learn English?

If this registered voting problem is ever solved, however, others will quickly appear. Many registered Hispanics don't bother to vote, especially in primaries, where New York politics is generally decided. So what is supposed to be done then? The logical conclusion to this nonsense is that the federal government will eliminate elections altogether, and then the federal courts will directly appoint all state and local officials, making sure of the proper ethnic blend.

In the meanwhile, in a parallel problem, every state and locality is bellyaching about an "undercount" in the census, and demanding that the missing people be added on to their numbers. It is a curious spectacle to see mayors and governors, many of them committed to Zero Population Growth, hysterically insisting that there are millions of missing who must be rounded up and added to the list. No one ever complains of "overcounting." "Undercounting" is of course a modern phenomenon. In the old days, the only point of the census was to count people so that electoral votes and total representation could be allocated to the states. Now, of course, states and localities get lots of federal taxpayer handouts per person, and hence the scramble to count as many as possible, including bums, pigeons, and falcons. Dollars provide a far greater lure than mere representation.

Secretary of Commerce Mosbacher has wisely decided not to "adjust" the original census count, but not before giving the case away by having the Census Bureau estimate, with absurd precision, the number and percentage of people it missed in each state and locality. But if the count itself, the actual count of numbers, erred and missed people, how in the world can the Census Bureau state, for example, that it undercounted the population of Baltimore by 4.7 percent? How it can possibly know what it failed to count, especially with such precision? The answer is that it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can't, and the seeming precision is totally spurious. The estimates of missing are arrived at by mere statistical manipulation and massage of the data. But the whole point of the census is that, for once, an agency *doesn't* rely on faulty sampling theory (based on an unsupported, arbitrary, and wrong assumption that samples are always distributed around the "population" figure via a bell-shaped "normal" curve). The unique thing about the census is that, every ten years, it doesn't sample; it goes out and tries to count. To "adjust" such figures is to undercut the whole point of a census.

According to the theorists, most of the "undercounted" are Hispanics, who deliberately make themselves scarce at census time. Why do they do so? First, they have an innate distrust of the government, and don't want to be counted. Surely a healthy instinct, even though much of the reason for the distrust may be that the said "missing" generally have something to hide. Many of them, once again, are illegals, who obviously don't want to call themselves to the attention of government. All well and good, but then, as we said above, why should illegals be represented in Congress or in the handout line? And again—and this applies to both blacks and Hispanics—many of the male residents of the inner city don't want to be counted lest their female consorts and progeny be deprived of welfare payments or public housing. OK, but then again, surely they shouldn't be represented in government. ●

THE SHORT LIBERTARIAN QUIZ

PALEO or NIHILO/MODAL?

Some readers have been puzzled over the meaning of such terms as "paleo-libertarian" and "modal libertarian." We hereby provide a handy 10-question quiz, based on events or issues in the recent news, to clarify the issue and help you answer the question: ***Are you a Paleo, or a Modal?***

1. Do cops have the right to require law-breakers (e.g. drugged-out speeders) to stand still and be frisked? (The Rodney King case.)
Paleos: Yes. **Modals:** No.

2. Do bums have the right to stink up public libraries and to expose themselves to children there?
Paleos: No. **Modals:** Yes. (Mary Gingell and the LP).

3. Do bums have the right to clog up, beg, and harass people on the public streets?
Paleos: No. **Modals:** Yes.

4. Was the U.S. right to go to war against, and massively bomb, Iraq?
Paleos: No. **Modals:** Either: Who cares? or No answer.

5. Is the U.S. government right to outlaw racial or religious discrimination in employment or housing?
Paleos: No. **Modals:** (Apparently) Yes.

6. Should all residents of the United States, including aliens, have the right to vote in U.S. elections?
Paleos: No. **Modals:** Yes.

7. Do parents have the right to stop their young children from engaging in "consensual" sex and pornography?
Paleos: Yes. **Modals:** No.

8. Do parents have the right to instruct their young children in their religion?
Paleos: Yes. **Modals:** No.

9. Does one nationality have the right to become independent of the domination of another (e.g. Croats or Slovenes from the Serbs in Yugoslavia)?
Paleos: Yes. **Modals:** Either: Who Cares? or No (because "nations" are a "collective" and "only individuals have rights.")

10. Should all public matters in the United States be conducted in English?
Paleos: Yes. **Modals:** No (Because all languages should have "equal access").

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Judge Thomas and Black Nationalism

by M.N.R.

In the process of combing through Judge Clarence Thomas' words and deeds over the years, some interesting anomalies have appeared. One is an apparent commitment to the concepts of "natural law" and "natural rights." Since everyone seems to be focused almost exclusively on abortion, the pro-choicers leapt on the question of whether this means that the fetus enjoys natural rights. More important, though neglected, is whether born persons have such rights. Nowadays, natural righters are considered leftish, but in general and over the years, there is only one political position consonant with a full and complete commitment to the pre-constitutional natural rights of the individual, rights that are indeed constitutionally mandated by the forgotten Ninth Amendment. And that position is "libertarian." I am not of course concluding that Judge Thomas is a libertarian, but certainly one observer was correct when he concluded that a commitment to natural rights is scarcely consonant with the Frankfurter-Bork concept of "judicial restraint."

It also turns out that Judge Thomas once praised Louis Farrakhan for his stress on self-help by blacks. The result has been a storm over the question of black nationalism. Professional anti-anti-Semites, such as Henry Siegman of the American Jewish Committee and former New York City Mayor Ed Koch, demanded that Thomas repudiate the alleged anti-Semitism of "Minister" Farrakhan. (How come Farrakhan is called "Minister" while everyone else is "Reverend"?) Oddly enough, when Thomas issued a ringing statement repudiating all anti-Semitism, whether of Farrakhan or anyone else, this statement was branded unsatisfactory by Siegman *et al.* It seems that Thomas is supposed to be duty-bound to repudiate *all other possible* statements by Farrakhan, since apparently anti-Semitism taints all statements by an anti-Semite, on whatever subject, beyond repair. This position strikes me as absurd to the point of idiocy. If, for example, Hitler or Stalin or Pol Pot or whoever once issued a statement that 2+2=4, would that mean that none of us could hold this truth any longer?

Black nationalism is more natural and libertarian than compulsory integration.

It seems, then, that Justice Thomas might be something of an unknown quantity. Black separatism, or black nationalism, has long struck me as far more compatible with human nature, as well as far more libertarian, than the compulsory integration beloved of left-liberalism. Black nationalism has also tended to appeal to the dark-skinned black masses, as contrasted to the appeal of compulsory integration to the light-skinned (what used to be called "mulatto") Negro elite. So threatening have black nationalist leaders been to those elites that they have been smeared and discredited, like Marcus Garvey, or murdered, like Malcolm X.

Black nationalism, however, has never been thought through satisfactorily. The problem is: in what land, on what soil, is that black nation supposed to have its being? Militant black nationalism within a nation that is only 20 percent black can only be a recipe for disaster. Black nationalism, then, is only viable on the land of some separate black nation. Where is that supposed to be? One classic solution was proffered in the early twentieth century by Marcus Garvey: a return to Mother Africa. This, indeed, was the favorite solution of Abraham Lincoln and other anti-slavery Americans before the Civil War when the inevitable question arose: what is to be done with the freedmen? The fact that black leaders, in one of those dazzling name changes they command us to perform every generation or so: from "colored" to "negro" to "black," now order us to use "African-American," might imply a yearning to return to the mother Continent. But the experiment of Negro repatriation to Liberia, launched with the purchase of that land by the American Colonization Society in 1821, did not turn out very well. American Negroes, already deracinated and detribalized, quickly formed a ruling elite oppressing the darker-skinned tribes in the area, Africa being a congeries of separate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and conflicting tribes. The rule by the hated American Negro minority was kept in place by the United States and by the Firestone Rubber Company. Only in the early 1980s did the black African tribes finally overthrow the hated rule of the American Negro elite, and Liberia has been a chaotic mess ever since.

The other possible plan was proposed by the Communist Party during its militantly radical period of the 1920s, before the Communist line got permanently corrupted into left-liberalism by the Popular Front era of the mid-1930s. This was the idea of the Black Nation, a separate black republic to be carved out of U.S. territory. The plan was to turn over the original slave plantations—the "Black Belt"—to the slaves or their descendants. Even by the 1920s, however, it was too late and too long after slavery for that plan to have any viability, or for the slaves and their old plantations to have any hope of being correctly matched. A modern, updated version of the Black Nation idea, however, has more plausibility. This plan would be to turn over to a new black nation all areas within the U.S. that now have a black majority: Harlem, Watts, East St. Louis, Detroit, Washington D.C., etc. Washington would be my preferred capital for the new black nation—to be called AfroAmerica?

This plan would have several supreme virtues. In the first place, it would set the American blacks free at last, free from what they see as white racism and what many whites see as parasitism over the white populace (through crime or welfare payments). Independent at long last, liberated from what they see as the institutionalized legacy of slavery, the blacks would finally be free to find their own level. It would indeed be a pleasure to see President Jesse Jackson holding forth from the Black (?) House. And secondly, the plan would have the even greater virtue of busting up the swollen U.S. imperium from within. Radical decentralization, the promise of the Tenth Amendment, genuine multiculturalism, would at last be secured. A precedent would then be set for another, Hispanic devolution, in which all the Spanish-speaking areas would at last achieve their own nation. *La Raza* liberated at last! Instead of desperately trying to expand the census counts of blacks or Hispanics, instead of gerrymandering districts to try to force-feed more Hispanic representatives, all could be represented in their own *Nueva Espana*. Yes! if Latvia deserves its own nation, if Slovenia should at long last be free of external conquerors, why not San Antonio or the South Bronx? What a vision! And Poppy can then preside over what's left of the American imperium from his redoubt at Kennebunkport. ●

"Tolerance," Or Manners?

by M.N.R.

Like ladies' hemlines, there are changing fashions in libertarian writing. Libertarians, who pride themselves as individualists, are all too often lemmings following the latest trend. The very latest trend among libertarians is to write vehemently, indeed "intolerantly," about the importance of tolerance, and how much they grrr, *hate* "intolerant people." Every manjack and his brother is denouncing "intolerance" these days, along with a lot of gaseous pseudo-philosophic hokum about the relationship between one's ideas and one's "tolerance" toward the ideas of others.

There is a curious anomaly here that has gone unnoticed. One of the things that strikes a person who first encounters Modal Libertarians is their surpassing rudeness, their overwhelming boorishness, their total lack of manners. It is libertarians, and only libertarians, who will call you up, as a perfect stranger, and proceed to denounce you for various deviations, or for alleged contradictions on page 851. It is only libertarians who, learning a few syllogisms about liberty, and having read next to nothing, consider themselves perfectly qualified to harangue learned men on their alleged errors. It is only libertarians who conclude, simply by virtue of announcing themselves as libertarians, that your house is their house and your possessions their possessions: an implicit assumption of communism of libertarian possessions. And oddly enough, or maybe not so oddly, the very people who are bleating most loudly against "intolerance" are some of the worst offenders. The "philosophy" is really a smoke-screen, for the real problem is decent manners and their lack of them; and when some of us react against those boors, we are of course denounced for being "intolerant." The ill-mannered wish to ride roughshod over the rest of us, and then howl about "intolerance" whenever we decide to resist. Note the typical Modal ploy: shifting the focus of attention from manners and behavior to abstruse discussions of philosophy. This

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

move enables them to focus on the charge that we are intolerant of their "ideas," that we are betraying our responsibility of engaging in continuing dialogue or "conversation" about ideas, when the real problem is them; their boorish "aggression" and lack of manners.

Manners are vital to the quality of life; civility is a crucial requirement of civilization. It softens edges, and makes social life worth living. Note that I am not calling for the punctilio of a seventeenth-century Spanish grandee: just ordinary decent behavior. But that is what is so sorely lacking. Much of the current wave of Political Correctness is a crazed attempt to continue and to justify swinish behavior, while trying to substitute a host of formal rules for decent politeness. But these formal rules are the reverse of manners, for they are used as clubs to impose one's will on others, all in the name of "sensitivity."

Thus, suppose that someone is talking or speaking, ether at a gathering or a formal lecture, and happens to refer to Ms. X as a "distinguished actress." The feminist language police are then apt to appear, shouting out that "actress" is an "insensitive" and sexist word and that the speaker must use the gender-neutral term "actor" (or who knows, maybe next it will be "actperson."). Here is a typical case where, in the name of imposing "sensitivity," the thought police are deliberately taking over in a power play, cowing the speaker through smears when everyone knows he was simply using standard terminology, and being unbearably rude and barbaric in the course of that takeover.

The thought police have only one virtue; clarity. At least you know what side they are on. But how about our "anti-intolerance" Modals? What would they have to say here? Would they condemn the feminists for being "intolerant"? Or would they condemn us for being "intolerant" of the thought police" Or maybe both? All is confusion. On the other hand, focus on decent manners and the answer becomes clear. The rude boors in this example are the feminist thought police. The philosophic tail-chasing that says, as one recent Modal writer put it, "we must be tolerant even of the intolerant" would be simply irrelevant here. For there is no obligation of any sort to be polite to rude people. On the contrary, those who have breached civility are "the aggressors," and should be tossed out on their ear. To absorb and agree with this point, one does not need any high-flown philosophic theory: just plain common sense and a sense of decency.

It strikes me too that since Modal libertarianism is lifelong adolescent rebellion against one's parents, one's neighbors, and the bourgeoisie generally, that this revolt against good manners, and its displacement into bleating about the "philosophy of tolerance," is characteristic Modal behavior. The Modal rebels against what used to be standard parental teaching about manners, and challenges such teachings with pseudo-profound blatherings about tolerance, metaphysics, and the theory of knowledge.

A final point about the private telling of jokes, which can be one of the great charms of social intercourse. Jokes, of course, almost always have *some* group or other as the butt of the joke: whether it be gender, age, religion, occupation, or ethnic group. The Politically Correct grinches, having no sense of humor whatever, are trying in effect to outlaw every joke as "insensitive" to some group or other, and therefore not politically correct. But hyper-sensitivity is one of the great barriers to civilized discourse and social relations, and can make such relations virtually impossible. Every such group, instead of being encouraged to bellyache, should get off its high horse. Modal Libertarians, of course, are up there with the anti-joke grinches, in the name of "tolerance" rather than "sensitivity." The Modals are just as despotic and just as crippling of joy through rotten manners.

Suppose, for example, someone, Mr. A, is telling a joke of which the butt is Group G. Simple politeness and good manners would lead Mr. A not to tell the joke if one of his listeners, say Mr. B, is obviously a member of Group G. On the other hand, if A doesn't realize it, or if turns out that one of B's friends or relatives happens to be a G, it would be incredibly boorish for B to denounce A as bigoted, insensitive, and all the rest. Modals should be stuck here; for they would have to figure who to denounce: A, for being "bigoted" against Group G; B for being "intolerant" of A's jokes; or both for being intolerant of the other. In practice, of course, we know how Modals come down, and it is invariably with the "sensitive" and the Politically Correct. The emphasis on manners, in contrast, would, in effect, tell B to pipe down, stop being boorish, and lighten up: humor is one of the great joys of the world. ●

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Welcome, Slovenia!

by M.N.R.

At the time of writing, it looks very much as if those wonderful, truly heroic Slovenes are going to Make It. Against all odds, against the determined opposition of the United States, the Soviet Union, and all the other European states—all devoted to the common State interest of preserving whatever State *status quo* happens to exist—it looks as if Slovenia, after a thousand years of subjection, is going to be allowed to become free and independent. If so, this will be the first new nation in Europe since the aftermath of World War I, and unlike *those* besotted countries, Slovenia is indeed a genuine nation in every sense, with a common religion, language, and culture. Unlike post-Versailles nations, Slovenia does not contain one ethnic group lording it over another. Slovenia ia almost totally ethnically Slovene, a marvelous productive group of two million in the extreme northwest of Yugoslavia, on the border between Austria and Italy.

The Slovenes, unlike the Croats, have never been independent. For centuries before World War I, the Slovenes existed under the comparatively mild rule of the Austro-Hungarian Habsburg empire. When the Austro-Hungarian empire collapsed, why did the Slovenes join newly-created Yugoslavia? Unlike the Croat leadership, which was tragically sucked in by the honeyed and mendacious Serb rhetoric about a new "south Slav" people to be forged out of many different and clashing nationalities, the Slovenes joined up for more practical and rational reason. As staunch defenders of Austria-Hungary against Italian aggression during World War I, the Slovenes were afraid, and for good reason, that Italy, puffed up by being on the winning side during the war, would take the occasion to punish the Slovenes and annex Slovenia to the wannabee Italian Empire. Hence, the Slovenes joined Yugoslavia in self-defense, and were rewarded by managing to keep their territory against the Italian threat.

The Slovenes, however, had even less in common with the Serbs than the latter's ancient enemies, their fellow westerners, the Croats. In Tito's Yugoslavia, Slovenia proved to be more Western, thriftier, more bourgeois and more progressive than even the Croats, let alone the rest of benighted Yugoslavia. Like the Croats, Catholic in a sea of Eastern Orthodoxy, the Slovenes have a separate language, and have the highest income in Yugoslavia, many times that of the rest of the country. The land is industrialized, the streets neat and clean in the Austrian and Swiss manner. Even more than the Croat "Communist" economists, the Slovene economists led the country as early as the 1960s, in calling for free markets and privatization. I well remember meeting, long ago, the cheery Slovene economist Alexander Bajt, I suppose nominally Communist, at the University of Virginia campus, who was even then writing on behalf of capitalism and free markets.

Slovenia is a genuine nation in every sense, with a common religion, language, and culture.

And so the Slovenes, like the Croats, wanted out of Yugoslavia, and particularly wanted out from under the domination of the imperialist, and still strongly Communist, Serbs. And the Slovenes, while much smaller in number than the Croats, did not have the embarrassment of a large Serb minority within their mountainous borders. And yet of course the Serbs were not about to let go. How, then, have the Slovenes come to achieve their independence, despite the U.S. and other powers moaning about the "territorial integrity of Yugoslavia?"

Unfortunately, the agent of triumph was not devotion to abstract justice. What did it was the force of Slovenian arms. In the latter two weeks of June, the Yugoslav army, dominated by Serb officers and a devotion to Communist rule bolstered by being a highly paid elite within the country, determined to bring Slovenia to heel, and to capture its frontier posts. The federal Yugoslav army bent on taming the Slovenes was headed by two Serb fanatics: General Bogojc Adzic, the Chief of Staff, and tank commander General Zivota Avaramovic, fresh from crushing the overwhelmingly Albanian Serb-run region of Kosovo. And yet the haughty Yugoslav

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

army, one of the most powerful in Eastern Europe, and its mighty tank corps, was fought to a standstill by the heroic Slovene guerrillas, who beat back the Yugoslav army and inflicted unacceptable losses. Once again, as in all guerilla victories, the key was ardent, virtual unanimous support by the Slovene people in defense of their freedom against a hated external force, as well as intimate knowledge of the terrain by the guerrillas. Moreover, the conscripted Yugoslav soldiers, generally not Serbs, deserted in droves, or surrendered under fire.

By early July, the more moderate Serb who is Defense Minister of Yugoslavia, Veljko Kadijevic, threw in the towel, and admitted that the operation against Slovenia had been a big mistake. Assessing the situation in mid-July, the Yugoslav military came to the conclusion that it faced only two choices: either occupying every inch of Slovenia and preparing to massacre the entire population, or withdrawing totally and allowing the Slovenes to decide their own fate. Almost unanimously, they decided that withdrawal was the only way; even the Serb fanatics concluded that letting the Slovenes go would allow them to concentrate more closely on the even more hated Croats. And the Slovenes, who before the battle had been willing to settle for sovereignty within a loose Yugoslav confederation, were now both embittered by the Serb aggression and emboldened by their heroic victory against far superior numbers and firepower. A free Slovenia had been baptized in blood, and the die appeared to be cast.

During the 1980s, and long before the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe, I had the occasion to visit Slovenia, and fell in love with the land and its people. I was able to stay in Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, in a Holiday Inn, unique in the then-Communist bloc . Holiday Inn enjoyed a strange co-ownership arrangement with an old "people's owned" Communist hotel, which literally surrounded the Holiday Inn. While eating dinner in a Ljubljana restaurant, I was surrounded by charming young people who saw that I was western, and peppered me with questions about life in the United States. (Needless to say, we spoke in English, since I knew no Slovenian.) I tried to tell them that they were better off than the Soviet-dominated countries, but they were hearing none of it. They all found life in Communist Yugoslavia "boring," and they longed to get out to the West.

Welcome, Slovenia, and bless you. You are now part of the West, and no thanks to George Bush *et al.* You won your freedom, like the American revolutionaries, both with ideology and with the sword. ●

PC Cinema: Psychobabble Gets Nasty

by Mr. First Nighter

I'm beginning to think it's all a long-range leftist plot. First, they tear down our love and admiration for our own culture, by preaching cultural relativism and the irrationality of ethics. "All cultures are equal," there *is no* trans-cultural morality, and therefore (and self-contradictorily) it is *immoral* to count your own culture superior to others. That's Phase One. And then, after several decades of pushing this line and converting everyone to it, comes the Phase Two sockeroo: there *are*, after all, moral principles and trans-cultural norms, but what they teach us is that our own culture and values are evil: racist, sexist, heterosexist, *et al.*, and *ad nauseam*. Morality exists, after all, but what it teaches is that *we* have been immoral all along, and everyone else is superior: a transvaluation of values. Phase One is the necessary softening up process for Phase Two, a process we are now undergoing.

This summer's cinema is rife with PC, spearheaded by a new trend. Psychobabble, for decades marked by the sickening treacle of "I'm OK, You're OK, Everyone's OK," to get us off our ideas of moral norms, has now shifted gears into a new, far more directly vicious phase: "Middle-class, middle-aged, achieving, white males [MMAWM] are definitely *not* OK," as a matter of fact, they need the figurative or even literal equivalent of a shot in the head. A direct, brutal, and vicious assault on MMAWM has now begun.

Of course, it can't be solemn and preachy. Even the guilt-ridden MMAWMs in our debased culture are not quite ready for *that*. It has to be done, then, in the sugar-coated pill of "comedy," bitter and witless pills which apparently our downtrodden Atlases, the MMAWM, are ready to swallow without seeing the danger or the assault. In that way, the prosperous, unheeding, American bourgeoisie are happy to pour in the dollars to finance their own

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

destruction.

The two particularly vicious anti-MMAWM "comedies" are *Regarding Henry* and *What About Bob?* In Mike Nichols' *Regarding Henry*, vicious go-getting lawyer, Harrison Ford, is redeemed by being shot in the head. Now a quasi-vegetable, he *therefore* becomes a dopey, loving, childlike, good human being, *because* of being deprived of most of his humanity. This sickening story is so blatant that it strikes even liberal critics as idiotic, so that there is at least a chance that this rotten movie will not be a hit.

Unfortunately, it seems that the other horror, *What About Bob?* has become a hit, helped by the fact that the vicious leech is the genuinely funny Bill Murray. In this movie, successful, uptight shrink Richard Dreyfuss is literally driven insane by patient Bill Murray, who, in the guise of sweet, loving worship of his shrink, turns Dreyfuss' entire loving but simpering family against him. Once again, evil is the MMAWM who is figuratively shot in the head by Bill Murray, and in fact Dreyfuss is never really redeemed, but remains permanently destroyed. The fact that of all MMAWMs, shrinks above all often deserve to be eviscerated softens us up, but should not blind us to the radical evil of this movie.

Other summer hits do not quite reach the moral depths of these two films, but are sickening in their own right. *Thelma & Louise* celebrate females achieving power and, "liberated" and on the road, committing violence against hated maledom. Kevin Costner's *Robin Hood* manages to ruin the Robin Hood story by substituting gritty mud and "realism" for adventure and romance, by filming the movie in greys and browns, by sticking P.C. blacks and feminists into a medieval English drama, and by having the Good Guys of Sherwood Forest speak terrible English in flat Midwest and California accents, while the Bad Guys speak in English accents. As one reviewer pointed out, this leads one to believe that these are American colonials somehow stuck in a time warp in the middle of Merrie England. Where is Errol Flynn now that we need him? — M.N.R. ●

P.C. Watch

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr.

Black Flag?

In a recent Raid commercial, a housewife sprays a fast-moving, sneaker-clad roach she calls "homebug." When civil rights groups complained that the ad was racist, it got zapped. "Homeboy" is a synonym for "urban youth," says the *Washington Post*. Also killed was another anti-bug commercial, this one for Black Flag, that had a spray-can-waving housewife saying: "Their kind deserves to die." "Blacks, Hispanics, everyone you can image complained," the ad agency told the *Post*. "We even heard from a Hungarian."

Should *Ebony* Run White Ads?

Amidst a bankrupt city government, the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs has been spending tax money checking all the ads in American magazines for the last 20 years, and finding—yes—"stereotyping, under-representation, and de facto segregation." Blacks represent 12% of the U.S. population, but only 3% of the characters in ads, says the department. And when they are depicted, it is often as "athletes, musicians, or objects of charity." The answer? Affirmative action. The city bureaucrats want the magazines, which vainly pointed out that ad agencies prepare the ads, to "establish goals for improved representation of blacks and other minority members."

Fair Harvard

The Wall Street Journal started the rehabilitation of black neoconservative Harvard professor Glen Loury by quoting him extensively in favor of the nomination of Clarence Thomas. Loury has not been in the news much lately, because the tenured prof was in the news before. When the Reagan administration nominated him, at the urging of Irving Kristol, for a high post in the Education Department, it turns out, says James Ledbetter in the *Village Voice*, that Loury had "defaulted on student loans," "fathered and been jailed for nonsupport of a second child out of wedlock," and been "arrested for beating and stomping his young mistress" after "a police car chase prompted by prostitutes in his company, for possession of cocaine and a homemade crack pipe." Can Loury really be a neocon? Sounds like a Modal Libertarian to me.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Note: The *WSJ*'s legal editor, Gordon Crovitz, praised Thomas in a recent column as "another Thurgood Marshall." What has happened to the Right, that this is supposed to be a compliment?

The Differently Served

The regulations for Bush's American With Disabilities Act have just been issued, and handicapped groups are upset. Even though this law now forces a company to hire, for example, a page-turner for a handicapped employee who can't use his hands to read, the regs do not mandate a personal servant for each handicapped person. That was purposely left vague, says EEOC chairman Evan Kemp, "to allow for the expansion of interpretations in the future." Mandating a servant would have been "difficult to sell politically." Unacceptable, said lobbyist Bob Carr. "We have to go to court over this."

Make it Bare Mountain

A non-union coal company is about to mine Blair Mountain, West Virginia, and union activists are calling it "blasphemy," for this was the site of a pitched battle in 1921 between striking workers and federal troops.

The very left-wing union went on strike to establish union power, so the company hired replacement workers. As usual in coal strikes, the union started killing the "scabs," so the company hired private guards to fight back. When an army of 10,000 armed unionites attacked the company, President Harding sent in the troops. There was a literal battle, but it was the end of the mine union until FDR gave it special privileges, including virtual immunity from prosecution for violence, during the New Deal.

In reporting on this story, the *New York Times* denounced the company towns of this period, which firms provided to get workers to move to the uninhabited mine sites. Imagine, says the *Times*, those vicious capitalists provided housing, churches, stores, schools, parks and police—all private—for the workers who flocked from all over the country to be oppressed.

Send Them to Their Flock

Sea Shepherds, an environmental group dedicated to saving dolphins and turtles from fishermen's nets (but not fish, for reasons I don't fully understand), is now armed, and prepared to kill any humans who get in their compassionate way.

Shepherd ships have been ramming non-P.C. fishing vessels, but recently, a Taiwanese boat maneuvered out of the way, and rammed the Sea Shepherd's craft. This "outrage" prompted the pistol packing. May the Taiwanese respond with .50 caliber machine guns.

That October Surprise

I have heard ironclad proof from a former high government official that Bill Casey, spy and campaign manager for Reagan-Bush, flew to Paris on the Concorde several times during the fall of 1980. Maybe he was visiting the *Moulin Rouge* in the middle of a hot presidential race, but somehow I don't think so.

Long May It Wave

"The suggestion that the Confederate battle flag be removed has brought heartburn to this black writer, who cannot buy the socialist philosophy of the Garrisons and the Sumners of yesteryear or today, and would rather wave a Confederate battle flag as a symbol of striving for independence than a food stamp or a welfare check," wrote the late W. Earl Douglas in the *Charleston News & Courier* in 1978. "I cannot be convinced that Southern independence meant only the perpetuation of slavery, because history of the truthful kind tells me otherwise." The "Negro was merely used as an excuse for that war, while the real reason for it is reflected in every area of our lives, where the tentacles of government form the bands of a new slavery.

"Don't furl that Confederate battle flag. Let it wave all across the South to remind Americans that there exists here a yearning for liberty and independence that will not be denied. Let it fly as a testimonial to real men and real women who would rather work and fight than shed tears and beg for government charity. Finally, let it act as a cohesive force, drawing all Southerners together in the cause of freedom." (From *Southern Partisan*, P.O. Box 11708, Columbia, S.C. 29211, $14 a year.)

Death and Taxes

"J.C. Hyde's family farm has survived the boll weevil, the Great Depression, and the furious suburbanization of east Cobb County," wrote Bill Torpy in the *Atlanta Journal*. "But it may not survive the IRS."

Hyde, a slender, 82-year-old bachelor, farms 127 acres in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an expensive area near Atlanta, as his father and grandfather did before him. He still uses a mule because the hills are so steep, and because he likes to "really feel the earth." He sells his vegetables from the back of his old pick-up truck in nearby Marietta, and lives in an 1840 log cabin with no running water. ("I run to the well to get it," he says.)

Hyde's brother died, leaving him his half of the farm. Then, due to wet weather and his age, Hyde could only plow 15 acres this year. That made his land a non-farm to the IRS, and they say he owes $563,000 in inheritance taxes.

"I never owed nobody nothing," says Hyde. "This has got me worried sick." The IRS wants him to sell his farm to raise the money. "If I have to do that, I'd die," he said. "This land is part of me. I couldn't do anything else, couldn't go anywhere else."

What Makes Detroit Dangerous?

The NAACP, says *American Renaissance*, is suing Michigan insurance companies for racism—because they charge more for auto insurance in black Detroit than in the white suburbs. What about the fact that cars are stolen much more often in the city than the suburbs, and that there are many more accidents? An NAACP lawyer says it is all due to white suburbanites who drive into the city.

Hubba Hubba

The U.S. Commission on Minority Business Development wants to change its name. The word "minority," it says, is so negative that it hampers its work (handing out tax money to non-white businessmen). The commission has asked Congress to change "Minority" to "Historically Underutilized," so it can be known from now on as HUB. (From *American Renaissance*, P.O. Box 2504, Menlo Park, CA 94026, $20 a year.)

Mr. Joydog?

Rock star LaToya Jackson, sister to Michael, recently joined a demonstration at the Long Island Pet Cemetery. "You have to realize," she told the *New York Times*, that a "dog is the same as a child." Or a snake and a bird. Curled around her neck was her pet six-foot python, Adam. She left her pet cockatoo in the limo.

The owners of the cemetery are charged with burying 200,000 dead animals in a pit, rather than interring them in human fashion under full-size headstones, for which funerals pet owners paid upwards of $18,000.

Jackson watched as a pet grave was excavated. Inside the metal casket container there was no casket. "It's empty, it's empty," a lawyer shouted. "How could someone do something like this and live with themselves?" asked Jackson. The owner said he was "beyond anger." Burying the dog "was an emotional thing for us. Digging up her remains was worse. And now that she is not even there, words can't describe the feelings I have." Jackson was furious. She promised "to get back with my agency and my publicist and discuss this."

Note: A pet cemetery in Maryland, near Washington, D.C., boasts the Tomb of the Unknown Dog.

Half Nelson

Last year, when Communist murderer Nelson Mandela made his messianic U.S. tour, only Miami refused to bow down and worship. Although there was the usual big celebration, Hispanic leaders, including the major and most of the city council, criticized Mandela's endorsement of Fidel Castro.

Black leaders were enraged, says the *New York Times*. So they called for a tourist boycott of Miami, and some P.C. conventions complied. The Chamber of Commerce wants it to end, but no Hispanic apologies are forthcoming. Don't complain, said the very liberal Msgr. Bryan Walsh of the Archdiocese of Miami. The boycott is "a big step forward compared to throwing rocks."

Beyond the Pale?

Although it hasn't got much publicity, Clarence Thomas has been heavily criticized in the black community for divorcing his black wife and marrying a white woman. Thurgood Marshall's second wife came from the Philippines, but that's "all right. He's paid his dues," says Russell Adams, chairman of the Afro-American Studies Department at Howard University. Thomas, however, is "living the fantasy of his type."

If Thomas shows up at the confirmation hearings with his wife, says Cathy Hughes, the top D.C. black radio personality, "the rejection of his judicial prowess will be intensified."

"Professional black men almost always marry a lighter woman," says black psychologist Harriet McAdoo, which disgusts and angers darker "black women."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They "feel it's a rejection of their whole group. When a black man marries white, he is marrying beyond the pale."

Yellowstone To Burn Again

The National Park Service is proposing to reinstate its "burn, baby, burn" policy for Yellowstone and other parks, which was suspended after the last big fire. The environmentalist rule is that if careless campers start a fire, they should be charged with a felony, fined, and maybe even jailed, for that is unnatural, and fire fighters should try to put it out. But if a fire is started by lightning, it is natural, and should be allowed to burn.

Bohemian Grove

I never thought I'd sympathize with that boys' camp for the statist Establishment, the Bohemian Grove, but this summer their paganish festivities in the woods of Sonoma County, California, were invaded by EarthFirst! The ecoloons snuck into the "Cremation of Care" ceremony—which involves burning a make-believe owl by Rockefeller, Bechtel, Kissinger, and other worthies—and held a protest demonstration. By setting fire to a make-believe owl, said EarthFirst!, the Bohemians showed "disregard for the environment." I agree. They should have used a real one.

Boyz Will Be Boyz

When the black gang movie *Boyz N the Hood* opened, there was violence all across the country. Don't blame me, said director Jack Singleton, one of Hollywood's new affirmative action filmakers. Blame those "who would rather put our children in jail than in college." What a nice thought. Why not empty the prisons of their young inmates, and send them to the liberal universities? Full scholarships would be cheaper than jail, not to speak of all the justice that would be done.

Date Rape

"As I look back on it," wrote Vicki Williams in the *San Francisco Examiner*, "I realize I was date-raped by my first husband." Only then, he "was the boy I was going steady with. We were both 17." We were "watching TV, then began kissing. One thing led to another. It had happened before. But before, we'd always stopped. This time, he pressed on despite my pleas. Soon it was over. I was no longer a virgin."

"I'm sorry, but even now, raised consciousness or no, I still can't agree that my lusty young boyfriend, pushed beyond his self-control by a girl who tried to let him go just so far and no farther, was the same as a stranger who breaks into a woman's house and invades both her body and her psyche."

Women "can get drunk [with a man], go with him to his home (or invite him to ours), allow him liberties with no objections, and then suddenly decide we want to call a halt at any given point. Granted, that men should honor our requests to cease, but is it entirely fair to have put him and ourselves in such a position to begin with? After having done so, can we then cry innocently that we had no idea our actions might have been construed by the man as implied consent?" ●

Rothbard-Rockwell Report
Center for Libertarian Studies
P.O. Box 4091, Burlingame, CA 94011

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
San Francisco, CA
Permit No. 1987

The Rothbard-Rockwell Report is published by the Center for Libertarian Studies, Post Office Box 4091, Burlingame, California 94011. (800) 325-7257.
Editors: Murray N. Rothbard and Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. *Contributing Editor:* Sarah Barton, Joseph Sobran, "Frank W. Taussig." *Publisher:* Burton S. Blumert. *Managing Editor:* Sybil Regan. Subscription: $49 for 12 issues. Copyright ©1991 by the Center for Libertarian Studies. All rights reserved. Unauthorized reproduction of this newsletter or its contents by xerography, facsimile, or any other means is illegal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED